I.   INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated April 8, 2008, the claims have note been amended. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-16, and 18-21 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II.   SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are generally directed to maps in a computer graphics system. More specifically, a request for a map picture is received. Thereafter, a map file is obtained in response to the request. It is noted that the map file does not yet satisfy the request for the map picture. From the map file, a URL is determined that identifies a storage location of vector based map data. In addition, this vector based map data defines map objects of the map picture. The vector based map data is then obtained from the storage location at the determined URL. This vector based map data satisfies the request for the map picture. Lastly, the map picture is displayed.

The table below illustrates the support in the specification and drawings for such claim limitations:

CLAIM LIMITATION	SPECIFICATION/DRAWING SUPPORT
1. A method of obtaining a map in a computer graphics program comprising:	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0027]-[0028]-P8,L24-P9,L8;
receiving a request for a map picture;	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0017]-P5,L29-P6,L8; [0038]-P11,L22-29; [0070]-P18,L20-25; FIG. 5, step 500.
obtaining a map file in response to the request;	[0018]-P6,L9-18; [0021]-P7,L5-9; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; FIG. 1 - 122; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0047]-[0049]P13,L19-P14,L7; [0069]-[0071]-P18,L11-P19,L5; FIG. 5-500-502.
determining, from the map file, a uniform resource locator (URL) that identifies a	[0017]-[0018]-P5,L28-P6,L18; [0020]-[0021]-P6,L27-P7,L9; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0033]-P10,L7-14; [0044]-P13,L3-7; [0048]-[0049]-

storage location of vector based map data, wherein the vector based map data defines one or more map objects of the map picture;	P13,L27-P14,L7; [0059]-[0060]-P16,L4-12; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5.
obtaining the vector based map data from the storage location at the URL, wherein the obtained vector based map data satisfies the request for the map picture; and	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0017]-[0018]-P5,L28-P6,L18; [0020]-[0021]-P6,L27-P7,L9; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; [0033]-P10,L7-14; [0044]-P13,L3-7; [0048]-[0049]-P13,L27-P14,L7; [0059]-[0060]-P16,L4-12; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5.
displaying the map picture.	[0010]-P5,L6-7; FIG. 2; [0017]-[0018]-P5,L29-P6,L18; [0021]-P7,L5-9; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; [0049]-P14,L3-7; FIG. 1-116; [0052]-P14,L17-22; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5; [0071]-P18,L26-P19,L5; FIG. 5-506
8. An apparatus for obtaining a map computer-implemented graphics system comprising:	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0027]-[0028]-P8,L24-P9,L8;
(a) a computer;	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0018]-P6,L9-18; [0022]-[0024]-P7,L12-P8,L8;
(b) an application executing on the computer, wherein the application is configured to:	[0024]-[0028]-P8,L12-P9,L8;
(i) receive a request for a map picture;	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0017]-P5,L29-P6,L8; [0038]-P11,L22-29; [0070]-P18,L20-25; FIG. 5, step 500.

(ii) obtain a map file in response to the request;	[0018]-P6,L9-18; [0021]-P7,L5-9; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; FIG. 1 - 122; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0047]-[0049]P13,L19-P14,L7; [0069]-[0071]-P18,L11-P19,L5; FIG. 5-500-502.
(iii) determine, from the map file, a uniform resource locator (URL) that identifies a storage location of vector based map data, wherein the vector based map data defines one or more map objects of the map picture;	[0017]-[0018]-P5,L28-P6,L18; [0020]-[0021]-P6,L27-P7,L9; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0033]-P10,L7-14; [0044]-P13,L3-7; [0048]-[0049]-P13,L27-P14,L7; [0059]-[0060]-P16,L4-12; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5.
(iv) obtain the vector based map data from the storage location at the URL, wherein the obtained vector based map data satisfies the request for the map picture; and	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0017]-[0018]-P5,L28-P6,L18; [0020]-[0021]-P6,L27-P7,L9; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; [0033]-P10,L7-14; [0044]-P13,L3-7; [0048]-[0049]-P13,L27-P14,L7; [0059]-[0060]-P16,L4-12; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5.
(v) display the map picture.	[0010]-P5,L6-7; FIG. 2; [0017]-[0018]-P5,L29-P6,L18; [0021]-P7,L5-9; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; [0049]-P14,L3-7; FIG. 1-116; [0052]-P14,L17-22; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5; [0071]-P18,L26-P19,L5; FIG. 5-506
15. An article of manufacture comprising a computer program storage device storing instructions that when read and executed by a computer, results in the computer	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0025]-P8,L9-18; [0027]-[0028]-P8,L24-P9,L8;

performing a method for obtaining a map on a computer-implemented graphics system, wherein the method comprises:	
receiving a request for a map picture;	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0017]-P5,L29-P6,L8; [0038]-P11,L22-29; [0070]-P18,L20-25; FIG. 5, step 500.
obtaining a map file in response to the request;	[0018]-P6,L9-18; [0021]-P7,L5-9; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; FIG. 1 - 122; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0047]-[0049]P13,L19-P14,L7; [0069]-[0071]-P18,L11-P19,L5; FIG. 5-500-502.
determining, from the map file, a uniform resource locator (URL) that identifies a storage location of vector based map data, wherein the vector based map data defines one or more map objects of the map picture;	[0017]-[0018]-P5,L28-P6,L18; [0020]-[0021]-P6,L27-P7,L9; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0033]-P10,L7-14; [0044]-P13,L3-7; [0048]-[0049]-P13,L27-P14,L7; [0059]-[0060]-P16,L4-12; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5.
obtaining the vector based map data from the storage location a the URL, wherein the obtained vector based map data satisfies the request for the map picture; and	[0007]-P3,L28-P4,L11; [0017]-[0018]-P5,L28-P6,L18; [0020]-[0021]-P6,L27-P7,L9; [0030]-P9,L19-26; FIG. 3; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; [0033]-P10,L7-14; [0044]-P13,L3-7; [0048]-[0049]-P13,L27-P14,L7; [0059]-[0060]-P16,L4-12; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5.
display the map picture.	[0010]-P5,L6-7; FIG. 2; [0017]-[0018]-P5,L29-P6,L18; [0021]-P7,L5-9; [0027]-P8,L24-P9,L4; [0049]-P14,L3-7; FIG. 1-116; [0052]-P14,L17-22; [0069]-P18,L11-19; FIG. 5; [0071]-P18,L26-P19,L5; FIG. 5-506

III. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraphs (1)-(2) of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-16, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochevar (The Tecate Data Space Exploration Utility) in view of Bieber et al. (Design Hypertext Support for Computational Application). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Specifically, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as follows:

As to claim 1, Kochevar teaches the claimed "method of obtaining a map in a computer graphics program" comprising: "receiving a request for map picture" (Kochevar, the MapQuery Tool; figure 3); "obtaining a map file " (Kochevar, section 5.1 Visualizing Data in a Database; pages 161-162; the displayed map in figure 6); "determining, from the map file, a uniform resource locator (URL) that identifies a storage location of map data, wherein the map data defines one or more map objects of the map picture" (Kochevar, section 5.2, Browsing the World Wide Web; page 162); and "obtaining the map data from the location, wherein the obtained map satisfies the request for the map picture" (Kochevar, figure 7). It is noted that Kochevar does not teach the map picture is "vector based" map picture. However, Kochevar's graphical images on the web pages or html.doc (section 5.2, page 162) contain several different formatted graphical objects (Kochevar, any data source or repository whose access is controlled via a well-defined software interface; 1st paragraph, section 1, Introduction, page 157) including the "vector based" map picture as claimed (see also Bieber for an example of the well-known vector-based map, page 100, column 2, lines 8-12). This, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to down load the map picture from the Internet WebPages in Kochevar's reference containing "vector based" map picture because of Kochevar's system ability to access to an unlimited number of graphical web sites where the "vector based" map picture is used.

As to claim 8, Kochevar teaches the claimed "apparatus for obtaining a map computer-implemented graphics system" comprising: a computer (Kochevar, Abstract Visualization Machine; figure 1) and an application executing on the computer (Kochevar, page 159, section 2.2, Object Manager), wherein the application is configured to : "receiving a request for a map picture" (Kochevar, the MapQuery Tool; figure 3); "obtaining a map file" (Kochevar, section 5.1 Visualizing Data in the Database; page 161-162); "determining, from the map file, a uniform resource locator (URL) that identifies a storage location of map data, wherein the map data defines one or more map objects of the map picture" (Kochevar, section 5.2, Browsing the World Wide Web; page 162); and "obtaining the map data from the location, wherein the obtained map data satisfies the request for the map picture" (Kochevar, figure 7). It is noted that Wolff does not teach the map picture is "vector based" map picture. However, Kochevar's graphical images on the web pages or html.doc (section 5.2, page 162) contain several different formatted graphical objects (Kochevar, any data source or repository whose access is controlled via a well-defined software interface; 1st paragraph, section 1, Introduction, page 157) including the "vector based" map picture as claimed (see also Bieber for example of the well-known vector-based map, page 100, column 2, lines 8-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to down load the map picture from the Internet WebPages in Kochevar's reference containing "vector based" map picture because of Kochevar's system ability to access to an unlimited number of graphical web sites where the "vector based" map picture is used.

As to claim 15, Kochevar teaches the claimed "article of manufacture embodying logic that causes a computer-implemented graphics system to obtain a map" wherein the logic comprises: "receiving a request for a map picture" (Kochevar, the MapQuery Tool; figure 3); "obtaining a map file" (Kochevar, section 5.1 Visualizing Data in a Database; pages 161-162); "determining, from the map file, a uniform resource locator (URL) that identifies a storage location of map data, wherein the map data defines one or more map objects of the map picture" (Kochevar, figure 7). It is noted that Kochevar does not teach the map picture is "vector-based" map picture. However, Kochevar's graphical images on the web pages or html.doc (section 5.2, page 162) contain several different

-10-

formatted graphical objects (Kochevar, any data source or repository whose access is controlled via a well-defined software interface; 1st paragraph, section 1, Introduction, page 157) including the "vector-based" map picture as claimed (see also Bieber for an example of the well-known vector-based map, page 100, column 2, lines 8-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to down load the map picture from the Internet WebPages in Kochevar's reference containing "vector-based" map picture because of Kochevar's system ability to access to an unlimited number of graphical web sites where the "vector-based" map picture is used,

Applicant traverses the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

(1)   Kochevar does not teach, disclose or suggest obtaining a map file in response to a request for a map picture;

(2)   Kochevar does not teach, disclose or suggest determining from a map file, a URL that identifies a storage location;

(3)   Kochevar does not teach, disclose or suggest a URL that identifies a storage location of vector based map data;

(4)   Kochevar does not teach, disclose or suggest vector based map data that defines one or more map objects of a requested map picture; and

(5)   Kochevar does not teach, disclose or suggest displaying a map picture having vector based map data.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are generally directed to maps in a computer graphics system. More specifically, a request for a map picture is received. Thereafter, a map file is obtained in response to the request. It is noted that the map file does not yet satisfy the request for the map picture. From the map file, a URL is determined that identifies a storage location of vector based map data. In addition, this vector based map data defines map objects of the map picture. The vector based map data is then obtained from the storage location at the determined URL. This vector based map data satisfies the request for the map picture. Lastly, the map picture is displayed.

The cited references do not teach nor suggest these various elements of Applicants' independent claims.

To reject the present claims based on Kochevar, one must attempt to map each of the claim elements to the teaching of Kochevar.

The first claim limitation provides for receiving a request for a map picture. In rejecting this claim element, the office Action relies on Kochevar's MapQuery Tool illustrated in Figure 3. Page 161 of Kochevar describes the MapQuery Tool:

-11-

In the database world, the MapQuery Tool is provided so that graphical queries can be made for Earth science datasets whose geographical extents and timestamps fall within user-specified constraints. The tool is built around a world map upon which regions of interest can be specified (see Figure 3).

The second claim limitation provides for obtaining a map file in response to the request. This claim element is rejected based on "Kochevar, section 5.1 Visualizing Data in a Database; pages 161-162, the displayed map in figure 6)." Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse the rejection of this claim limitation. As claimed, in response to a request for a map picture, a "map file" is obtained. To read on these claim limitations and consistent with the Examiner's interpretation of the first claim element, Kochevar must provide that in response to the user marking a region of interest, a map file is received. However, Kochevar fails to provide a map file in response to any such specification of a region of interest. Beginning with section 5.1 on page 161, once the user marks a region of interest, a query message is sent to a database interface and the result of the query is returned to the Mapquery Tool that forwards it to an Intelligent Visualization System, accompanied by a select task directive. Such language fails to obtain a map file in response to a request. Instead, a query result is returned. A query result is not a map file whatsoever. As claimed and as set forth in the specification, a map file is a "file". No such file is taught or suggested, explicitly or implicitly, anywhere in Kochevar.

Kochevar continues and states that the intelligent visualization system (IVS) is executed by BigRiver where a stream of AVL code is produced that is sent to an abstract visualization machine for interpretation. Again, such language fails to provide any file whatsoever. Instead, a script is produced and executed by Big River (which is a visualization programming system consisting of a collection of procedures referred to as modules [see page 160]) and a stream of AVL code is produced and sent to a machine for interpretation. Such a script and/or code stream is not equivalent to the claimed "map file" in any way, shape, or form. More specifically, as claimed, the map file is used to determine a URL that identifies a storage location of vector based map data. Neither Kochevar's script nor Kochevar's stream of AVL code can be used to determine a URL that identifies a storage location of vector based map data (or a storage location for anything).

Kochevar further recites that the AVL program creates a new virtual world consisting of a collection of 3-D icons that each correspond to a dataset that was returned as the result of the initial query. Again, neither the icons nor the data set are even remotely equivalent to a "map file" or any

-12-

"file" whatsoever. Further, Kochevar states that each icon is an object whose physical appearance is a function of data-set type. Again, such an icon is not a file nor is it a URL.

In section 5.2, Kochevar provides that if an end-user chooses to browse the web, the default virtual world is supplanted by a new one that depicts a map of the Earth arrayed in 3-D. Further, select web sites are positioned in the world as 3-D icons as illustrated in Figure 6. Each icon is cloned from a single "hyperlink" prototype object that uses a state variable to store a URL.

The Office Action asserts that Kochevar's displayed map of figure 6 is equivalent to the map file. However, nowhere in figure 6 is the displayed map referred to as a file. Instead, as explicitly stated, figure 6 illustrates www sites depicted as 3-D icons on a world map. Again, Kochevar explicitly provides that web sites are positioned in the world as 3-D icons as illustrated in Figure 6 where each icon is cloned from a single hyperlink prototype object that uses a state variable to store a URL (each web site icon inherits a behavior that causes a data file pointed to by its URL state variable to be fetched when the icon is picked). As can clearly be seen, the world map and icons of figure 6 are not even remotely similar to a map file as set forth in the claims.

In response to the above arguments, the final Office Action merely states:

> In section 5.1, when a user mark a region of interest, depend on how the requested display data is selected by a user, either the meta-data associated with the data-set represented by the icon is displayed in a separate window, or a query message is sent to the Database requesting the actual data. In order to display a map (figure 6), it is inherently that the system must access to a file or dataset to collect the information in order to render the display.

Thus, rather than illustrating how and where the reference teaches the claimed file, the final Office Action merely states that in order to display a map, it is inherent that the system must access a file or data-set to collect the information to render the display.

Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such a suggestion. Firstly, it is not inherent. Secondly, the cited reference teaches away from the use of a file. As set forth in detail above and in the prior response, a stream of AVL code is used in an interpreter. The stream serves to create a new virtual world of 3-D icons that correspond to datasets. As is well known in the art, a stream of code that is used in an interpreter is not a file in any way, shape, or form. Further, the claims explicitly require that the file be obtained in response to the request. No such file is obtained in response to a request or otherwise in Kochevar.

Further, should the Patent Office continue relying on the "inherent" use of a file, Applicants respectfully request citations to relevant references as required in the MPEP. In this regard,

-13-

Applicants note that inherency "may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." *Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1269(Fed. Cir. 1991). Instead, to establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill." *Continental Can Co.*, 948 F.2d at 1268. In finding obviousness by inherency, the Office Action ignored the foregoing critical principles. The Office Action has not shown that the claimed file is necessarily present in the reference of record.

Applicants further note that as expressly claimed, from the map file, a URL is determined that identifies a storage location of vector based map data. In addition, the vector based map data defines one or more map objects of the map picture (that was requested). It is simply impossible to read the world map and icons of Kochevar onto the map file that is retrieved in response to a request for a map picture wherein the map file has URLs for storage locations of vector based map data for map objects of the picture. There is not even a remote similarity, explicitly or implicitly, in Kochevar to such claim limitations.

With respect to the claim limitation relating to the URL identifying the storage location of map data that defines map objects of a map picture, the Office Action relies on Kochevar Section 5.2, Browsing the World Wide Web; page 162. As described above, Kochevar provides the ability to display a virtual world that may be visualized. As set forth, a map of the Earth is arrayed in 3-D with web sites positioned as 3-D icons in the map. Once an icon is selected, the home page for a web site is visualized based on an inverted pyramid whose apex is centered on the chosen icon. The text and imagery for the home page is displayed as illustrated in Figure 7. As can be clearly seen, rather than displaying a map having map objects and vector based map data, Kochevar is utilized to display a virtual world for browsing the web wherein web sites are actually displayed within a pyramid on the map. Such a teaching is not even remotely applicable or similar to the presently claimed invention in any way, shape, or form.

Again, nowhere in Kochevar is there any type of map file that is retrieved in response to a request for a map picture. Further, as claimed, the map file contains particular and specific elements including a URL that identifies a storage location of vector based map data that defines objects for

the request map picture. Nowhere is such a location for a map object even remotely hinted at in Kochevar.

In response to the above arguments, the final Office Action asserts:

> The display of figure 6 shows a map of the selected portion of the earth, which also contains 3-D icons cloned from a Hyperlink prototype object and store a URL. The map file, which is used to render the display in figure 6, inherently contains the data of the 3-D icons and also their URL. Kochevar shows an example of the implementation of a WWW icon (page 158, figure 2), which is a map object of the map in figure 6.

In such an assertion, the Patent Office asserts that a map file is used to render the display of Figure 6. As stated above, nowhere is a map file or any file even remotely used to render anything in Kochevar. Instead, as described above, a stream of AVL code is sent to a visualization machine that interprets the code and creates the virtual world of FIG. 6. Such a process does not and cannot use a map file and in fact teaches away from such a use of a file since an interpreter cannot use a file in such a manner. Further, the 3-D icons contain the URL locations and not the map file itself. To read on the present claims, not only would the stream of AVL code have to equal to a file, but the stream of AVL code would have to have URLs themselves that identify a storage location of data. The action refers to the implementation on page 158, figure 2 to demonstrate how the URL for the storage location is set forth. Again, section 2.1 further asserts that the AVL language has objects that created, destroyed, and altered on the fly and are not part of a file whatsoever. In addition, Figure 2 illustrates that a URL is specified but there is no storage of vector based map data whatsoever at the URL. Further yet, Kochevar's figure 2 is merely part of an icon and not part of a file.

The Office Action admits that Kochevar fails to teach the map picture is "vector based" map picture. Without teaching such a claim limitation, it is impossible for Kochevar to teach or render obvious the presently claimed invention that is specifically directed towards and expressly claims vector based map data that defines map objects.

The Office Action asserts that Kochevar's graphical images on the web pages or html.doc contain several different formatted graphical objects including the vector based map picture as claimed. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. Nowhere in Kochevar is there even a remote hint that Kochevar's graphical images on web pages are vector based map objects. To the contrary, Kochevar expressly teaches that an inverted pyramid is displayed with an apex having an icon and text and imagery for the home page is displayed within

-15-

the pyramid (see Figure 7). Such a teaching does not teach, disclose, suggest, or hint at vector based map data whatsoever.

Further, not only do the claims require vector based map data, but the vector based map data must define map objects of the map picture. The only map displayed in Kochevar is a map of the Earth arrayed in 3-D with icons for different websites. Such icons are not vector based map objects or vector based map data whatsoever. Again, one must attempt to map Kochevar's claim elements consistently and such a mapping cannot be done with respect to the presently claimed invention.

Lastly, the claims explicitly provide for retrieving the vector based map data from the identified storage location at the URL and displaying the resulting map picture. Thus, the claims provide for displaying a vector based map having vector based map objects. Such a teaching is completely and wholly lacking from Kochevar.

The Office Action alleges that a map can be represented by a raster database, vector database, graphics/object database, and that there is no thing new in a displayed map in computer provided by a vector database. Applicants respectfully disagree. Raster based map data may be retrieved as a large file and is cumbersome. Significant advantages arise when using vector based map data. Further, the present invention provides a unique, novel, and nonobvious mechanism for retrieving and displaying a vector based map picture. Such a teaching is lacking from the cited art.

The Office Action lastly concludes:

> Kochevar also mentions that the type of database linked to the icons on the map can be any well known type of database for representing graphics in a user interface which clearly include the vector database representing a graphics object (e.g., 2D city map of NY city) within a map of the United States of America on display (page 157, column 1, 1st paragraph in section Introduction.

Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such assertions. Namely, as admitted in such a section, the icons are linked to a database. The present claims do not provide for linking to a database whatsoever. Instead, from a map file, URLS that identify a storage location of vector based map data is determined. No database or icons linked to databases are even remotely described. Further, icons linked to a database are not relevant to determining a storage location of vector based map data. Further, the Patent Office is presuming that a 2D city map of NY city within a map of the USA is a vector based map. Consistent with the prior art, such a map is likely to be a raster map and not a vector map.

-16-

In view of the above, Applicants submit that not only does Kochevar fail to teach numerous aspects of the claimed invention but it is completely illogical to apply Kochevar's teaching to the present limitations. Kochevar's teaching cannot be mapped to the present claims and does not even remotely address the claim limitations.

In response to the above arguments, the Office Action first asserts that Kochevar visualizes a home page for a website and that the text and imagery for the home page appears similarly as it would when visualized using a hypertext based browser like Mosaic. The final Action then asserts that the text and imagery on the Website are equivalent to the claimed map objects of the map picture.

Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. As explicitly stated in Kochevar,

> ...the home page for a Web site is visualized on the base of an inverted pyramid whose apex is centered on the chosen icon...Rather than having to page back and forth between hypertext documents as with Mosaic, in Tecate an end-user need only 'fly' about the virtual world to gain an appropriate viewpoint from which to view a desired document.

Such a teaching is not even remotely similar nor does it contemplate, allude to, or suggest, explicitly or implicitly, the present claims whatsoever. Applicants further note that they are having a difficult time responding to this Action because the reference is so far removed from the present field of invention and the present claims that there really is no similarity whatsoever. The present invention has a map file from which URLs are determined that identify storage locations of vector based map data that defines map objects of the map picture. In Kochevar, the icons may have URLs but the URLs do not define map objects of the virtual world being displayed. Instead, they merely define other websites that the user can "fly" to. There is no reason or rationale in Kochevar that suggests something different. Such websites are not map objects of a map picture whatsoever. Further, in accordance with the claims, the text and imagery of Kochevar's website cannot be map objects of a map picture unless the website itself is a map picture AND the text and imagery are obtained from URLs determined from a map file for the website AND the text and imagery are vector based map data. None of these three items are taught or disclosed in Kochevar or otherwise.

The Office Action continues and states that Bieber is "an example to show the well known of a vector based map data (page 100, column 2, lines 8-12)." Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. Bieber does disclose that maps may have vector based data. However, the invention is directed towards a map file that is used to identify the storage location of

-17-

vector based map data for objects in a map picture. Bieber does not disclose any separate storage of the vector based map data or a separation of the vector based map data and the storage of such map data from the map file that defines the map picture. The Examiner is ignoring multiple aspects of the invention and attempting to use references that even if combined would still fail to teach or even remotely allude to the invention as claimed.

The Examiner then continues and asserts "To convince Applicant about the well known of 'map picture having vector base map data,' Examiner uses the city map of south Florida Districts to illustrate the well known of a city map using a vector based database." The city map of south Florida Districts are set forth in Bieber's FIG. 1. However, Applicants note that merely because a map may have vector based data does not mean that Bieber teaches the invention as claimed. Applicants have asserted numerous times that it is the combination of features that enable the present invention and its uniqueness and nonobviousness. Such unique features include obtaining a map file in response to a request for a map picture where the map file is used to determine URLs for storage locations from which vector based map data for map objects of the map picture are retrieved and used to display the map picture. The mere ability for a map to have vector based map data combined with a virtual world for browsing the web cannot and does not result in such claim elements either alone or in combination.

Applicants further note that the use of the newly cited reference, Bieber, while issuing a final Office Action, when Applicants did not previously amend the claims is improper. The Examiner notes that Bieber's use was limited to illustrate the well known of a map picture having vector based map data. However, it is improper to issue a final rejection when using a new reference under the MPEP and existing case law. Nonetheless, Applicants have elected not to petition to remove the finality of the Action in order to expedite prosecution of this case.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Action has failed to establish a prima facie case of nonobviousness and is in error for failing to cite a reference that teaches a map file that is used to determine URLs for storage locations of vector based map data for map objects of a map picture as claimed.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are allowable over Kochevar and Bieber. Further, dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16, and 18-21 are submitted to be allowable over Kochevar and Bieber in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims

-18-

1, 8, and 15, respectively, and because they contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16, and 18-21, recite additional novel elements not shown by Kochevar and Bieber.

IV. CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fees are due at this time. Nonetheless, should any charges be deemed necessary, please charge any such fees, or credit any overpayments, to deposit account no. 50-0494 of Gates & Cooper LLP.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory A. Roy et al.

By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER LLP

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: June 5, 2008

By: /Jason S. Feldmar/
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187